UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,217	01/09/2007	Craig Black	US030 491 US2	1645
	7590 03/24/200 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 3001			WALCZAK, DAVID J	
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510-8001		001	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3751	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		App	lication No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/5	81,217	BLACK, CRAIG				
Office Action Summary			niner	Art Unit				
		Davi	d J. Walczak	3751				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appears o	on the cover sheet	with the correspondence ac	idress			
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE Masions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common period for reply is specified above, the maximum street or reply within the set or extended period for reply eply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IAILING DATE C of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In nunication. atutory period will apply will, by statute, cause t	OF THIS COMMUI in no event, however, may and will expire SIX (6) M he application to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this of ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>09 Januar</i> y	2007					
2a)□		2b)⊠ This action						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
- , —	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4) 🖂	Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the a	application.						
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)🛛	S)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are rejected.							
7)								
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ction and/or elect	ion requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	: a) accepted	or b)⊡ objected t	to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
2) Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/1/06</u> .	PTO-948)	Paper N	w Summary (PTO-413) lo(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application 				

Art Unit: 3751

DETAILED ACTION

Abstract

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract should be submitted on a separate sheet. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jecker.

In regard to claim 1, Jecker discloses a toothbrush comprised of a bristle plate having a cavity 16 therein and a duckbill valve assembly 17 disposed in the cavity.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jecker in view of Barinaga et al. (hereinafter Barinaga).

Art Unit: 3751

In regard to claim 2, Jecker discloses to duckbill valves 17. Although the Jecker reference does not disclose that the valves are secured via a flange member extending therebetween, attention is directed to the Barinaga reference, which discloses a method of forming duckbill valves wherein several valves 104A, 104B (see Figure 11) can be secured to each other via a flange member 104 in order to enable various valves to be formed in a single process and thereby simplify the assembly of devices that employ various duckbill valves (see Figures 11-12 and column 4, line 66 through column 5, line20). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the valves in the Jecker device can be formed with such a flange extending therebetween in order to enable the valves to be formed via a single process and thereby simplify the assembly of the device.

In regard to claim 3, the flange member disclosed by Barinaga is substantially flat.

In regard to claim 4, the duckbill valves in the Jecker reference have slits 19 that are parallel to each other (see Figure 1).

In regard to claim 5, although the slits 19 are arranged parallel to each other and not in a single line as claimed, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the slits can be arranged in any suitable orientation, including the claimed orientation, without effecting the overall operation of the device.

In regard to claim 6, the duckbill valves 17 are substantially identical.

In regard to claim 7, the valves 17 are sufficiently spaced to permit bristles 15 to be mounted to the bristle plate.

In regard to claim 8, Jecker discloses the use of two valves 17.

In regard to claim 9, Jecker discloses the use of more than two valves 17 (see lines 24-26).

In regard to claim 10, although the valves 17 are substantially identical and not of varying size, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the valves can be designed to have any suitable sizes (including varying sizes), depending on the needs of the user/manufacturer without effecting the overall operation of the device. Further, upon varying sized valves being employed, the valves would be considered "arranged to accommodate different fluids to flow therethrough".

In regard to claim 11, a holding member (the portion of bristle plate 14 that is positioned to the right of cavity 16 viewing Figure 2) is disposed over the duckbill valves and cavity.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Megill et al. reference is cited for disclosing another toothbrush that employs multiple duckbill valves.

Application/Control Number: 10/581,217 Page 5

Art Unit: 3751

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David J. Walczak whose telephone number is 571-272-4895. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huson Gregory can be reached on 571-272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David J. Walczak Primary Examiner Art Unit 3751

DJW 3/21/09

/David J. Walczak/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3751